DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 575 EC 131 783

AUTHOR Zettel, Jeffrey J.
TITLE The Education of Gifted and Talented Children from a Federal Perspective.
INSTITUTION Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE Dec 80
NOTE 39p.: This paper was written for and will appear in "Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children, Volume II," Weintraub, et al. (eds.), in preparation, Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Legislation; *Gifted; *Government Role; *History; *Talent
IDENTIFIERS Gifted and Talented Childrens Education Act 1978

ABSTRACT

The author describes the federal role in the education of gifted and talented children both from a social and a political perspective. The history of federal involvment with the gifted/talented population is depicted within a context of four time periods: the years prior to 1951; the period from 1951 to 1959; the decade from 1960 to 1970; and the years from 1971 to 1980. Among the highlights considered are P.L. 81-507, the National Science Foundation Act (which emphasized development of the sciences and basic research and for the first time focused attention on the needs of the gifted and talented); the National Defense Education Act (which called for the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of young men and women, increased talent identification efforts, and provided assistance to educational programs that were vital to national defense); P.L. 91-230, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 (which expressed concern over lessening national attention to the gifted and talented and voiced an intention that monies under the act be spent for gifted and talented programs); P.L. 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974 (which included gifted and talented education as part of the Special Projects Act); and the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978 (which called for the creation of a combination state formula grant and Commissioner discretionary grant program for gifted and talented education). Section by section analysis of the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978 is provided. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED197575

The Education of Gifted and Talented Children From A Federal Perspective

December 1980

by Jeffrey J. Zettel

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jeffrey J. Zettel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia

EC131783

Not to be used and/or reproduced without the expressed written consent of the author and The Council for Exceptional Children.

This paper was written for and will appear in Public Policy and the Education of Exceptional Children, Volume II, Weintraub, et. al. (eds.), in preparation, Reston, Va.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.

THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN FROM A FEDERAL PERSPECTIVE

by Jeffrey J. Zettel

> Society can choose to educate a few people exceedingly well or to educate a great number of people somewhat less well, but it cannot do both.(1)

The above statement written by John Gardner in 1954, graphically depicts the historical ambivalence that has often been demonstrated by not only the federal government, but society in general toward the education of gifted and talented children. Expressing similar sentiments, Abraham Tannenbaum wrote in the seventy-eight yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, "The cyclical nature of interest in the gifted is probably unique in American education. No other special group of children has been alternately embraced and repelled with so much vigor by educators and laymen alike."(2)

The purpose of this particular chapter, however, will be to examine this "cyclical nature of interest" from only a federal perspective. To best accomplish this, the evolution of the federal role in the education of gifted and talented children will be described from both a social and a political perspective. Furthermore, the history of federal involvement with this population will be depicted within the context of four essential time periods: 1) the years prior to 1951; 2) the period from 1951 to 1959; 3) the decade from 1960 to 1970; and 4) the years 1971 to 1980.

The Beginnings of Federal Interest

Prior to 1945 there was little, if any, federal concern for the education of gifted and talented children. Two events in 1946, however, changed much of this lack of federal interest. The first incident took place in a stretch of semi-desert land fifty miles outside of Alamogordo, New Mexico. The code name

for the experiment that would culminate at this location was Trinity. It's results were not only awesome, but devastating. For those present, in the words of William L. Laurence, there was "a sunrise such as the world had never seen".(3) On July 16, 1946 at 5:30 a.m. the United States exploded the world's first atomic bomb.

Three weeks later, a second event took place that vividly demonstrated the awesome power and responsibility of a nation possessing such a weapon. On August 6, 1945, the Enola Gay, a U.S. B-29 bomber, released a single missle over the Japanese city of Hiroshima. Within seconds, 60,175 of the city's inhabitants were dead or missing. Four square miles of civilization were vaporized. World War II, for all practical purposes, was over and America became the undisputed leader and defender of the free world.(4)

Almost overnight public interest and national political policy became dominated by the perceived need for technological advancement and financial support for the sciences. Over 100 public witnesses, appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on War Mobilization in 1945 called for the federal government to substantially increase its financial support for basic scientific research. Even President Truman in his inaugural address mentioned the vital need to develop our nation's scientific productivity. In his speech, the new President boldly proclaimed:

> We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas....American technological skills might revolutionize primitive agricultural techniques, raise the standard of living in Asia and Africa, and tame their rivers with new TVA's.(5)

The beginnings of a federal interest in programs for the gifted particularly within the fields of science and technology, therefore, were essentially present by 1946. What was needed, however, was a catalyst to catapult the

government into an active role.

Much of the pressure that was needed to accomplish this was brought about by a number of events that took place in 1948 and 1949 that demonstrated the intimate link between scientific research and our national defense: in February, 1948, Stalin seized Czechoslovakia; on June 24, the Soviet Union imposed a blockade on Berlin; on August 5, 1949, the U.S. State Department issued a 1,054 page "white paper" indicating that the world's largest nation (China) had fallen into Communist hands; and finally on September 23, 1949, President Truman released the dire statement, "We have evidence an atomic explosion occurred within the USSR."(6) The reaction of the 81st Congress was swift. In the Spring of 1950 it passed P.L. 81-507, the National Science Foundation Act.(7) Through this historic piece of legislation, the Congress not only turned its resources toward the development of the sciences and basic research, it also, for the first time, focused its attentions on the needs of the gifted and talented.

Essentially, the National Science Foundation Act was passed for six basic purposes. These were:

(1) to initiate and support basic scientific research and programs to strengthen scientific research potential and science education programs at all levels in the mathematical, physical, medical biological, engineering, social and other sciences...;

(2) to award scholarships and graduate fellowships in the above mentioned areas;

(3) to foster the interchange of scientific information among scientists in the United States and foreign countries;

(4) to foster and support the development and use of computer and other scientific methods and technologies, primarily for research and

education in the sciences;

(5) to evaluate the status and needs of the various sciences...; and

(6) to maintain a current register of scientific and technical personnel...and establish a national clearinghouse.(8)

Monies from the National Science Foundation (NSF) sponsored a variety of programs and projects aimed at improving the basic curriculum and encouraging gifted and talented students to pursue careers in mathematics and in the physical sciences. Among the more widely known projects funded by the Foundation during this period were the School Mathematics Study Group (SMSG), Physical Sciences Study Committee (PSSC), Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), Chemical Bond Approach (CBA), and Project Physics (PP). At a later date, NSF also helped to develop new curricula in the social sciences and humanities through projects such as Project Social Studies, Project English, and the Anthropology Curriculum Study.(9)

In summary, prior to 1951, the majority of federal interest and involvement in the education of the gifted and talented developed from a technological and scientific perspective. While the NSF did fund a number of projects aimed at the development of basic curricula, for the most part, federal aid to this population was concentrated in the form of university and graduate scholarships. Finally, much of the Congressional thinking regarding this population also became asssociated with basic and applied scientific research and its relationship to the general welfare of the country.

1951-1959: An Upsurge of Effort and Interest

During the early 1950's, public and governmental interest in the gifted and talented dwindled to one of its lowest points. Evidence of this disinterest was demonstrated by two investigations conducted at this time. While a nationwide survey completed in 1929 found that nearly two-thirds of the school

districts with populations over 25,000 had some form of ability grouping for their more abler students, a similar survey conducted in 1948 found that only 15 of these districts now reported having special classes for their gifted.(10) Another study performed in Ohio in 1951 revealed that only 2 percent of the State's schools indicated they provided any specialized services whatsoever to this population.(11) One of the factors that no doubt contributed to the disinterest in the education of the gifted during the early 1950's was an overall feeling of anti-intellectualism that swept the country during this period. Much of this thinking was exemplified by Senator Joseph McCarthy during his relentless attacks on the perceived communism and subversion he saw within all levels of government and throughout our systems of higher education. Anti-intellectualism also became a national campaign issue during the Presidential elections of 1952. Many saw the election to be one between the "eggheads" (those supporting the intellectual Adlai Stevenson) and the people of common sense (the followers of the Western-novel reading Dwight D. Eisenhower). When Eisenhower won, Time magazine concluded that the outcome of the election demonstrated "an alarming fact long suspected: there is a wide and unhealthy gap between the American intellectuals and the people."(12)

During the mid-1950's a number of occurrences pointed to a developing interest in programs for the gifted. One was the country's realization that it had an acute shortage of professional manpower. This fact was quickly brought to the attention of the President by the National Security Resources Board (NSRB) in 1952. NSRB, for example, estimated that while the United States needed an additional 160,000 qualified elementary teachers, only 33,000 were being graduated. Likewise, it calculated the annual demand for qualified engineers to be 30,000. By 1954, however, it predicted that only 17,000 new engineers would be graduating from the nation's colleges and universities.

Finally, turning to the need for well-trained manpower to help conduct foreign policy, NSRB pointed out the fact that between 1948 and 1952 only 13 Americans had been awarded Ph.D's in the Russian language. In its report to the President, the Board concluded: "We are short of people. If we are to do everything we need to do for ourselves and for others, every person must count. We can afford no slippage."(13)

Although a low national birth rate during the 1930's helped to contribute to this shortage in high-level manpower, public education came to receive the brunt of the criticism for this condition. Schools were charged with having too soft of curriculums and for not emphasizing basic skills. Many people argued that the gifted and talented were the most serious casualties of this avoidance to academic rigor and demand. Some, like Dael Wolfe of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training charged the public schools with failing to adequately stimulate or encourage academically gifted children to go beyond a secondary school education. According to Wolfe:

> Fewer than half of the upper 25 percent of all high school graduates ever earn college degrees; only 6 out of 10 of the top 5 percent do. Society fails to secure the full benefit of many of its brightest youth because they do not secure the education that would enable them to work at the levels for which they are potentially qualified.(14)

Others, like Admiral Rickover, proclaimed that the school's preoccupation with anti-intellectualism at this time was deeply hurting our technological and military race against Communism. Rickover expounded his theory that the cold war could be won through the earlier identification and acceleration of academically gifted students particularly within the area of science and engineering. Traveling throughout the country to spread this belief Rickover often concluded: his lectures with the statement: "it has been estimated that the efforts of less than one percent of the total population move the world forward. This small group is indispensable to the maintenance and

advancement of our civilization."[15]

Despite such efforts programs for the gifted and talented as well as federal interest, remained largely stagnant during the mid 1950's. It was not until 1957 that an event of such magnitude would take place that it would force the Congress into an unprecedented flurry of activity related to the education of the gifted and talented. On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union launched the world's first artificial satellite. Americans anxiously held their breath and watched silently as the 184.5 pound Russian Sputnik circled the globe. A furor of indignation engulfed the Congress. Representative Stuart Symington of Missouri demanded a special session. Senator Henry Jackson of Washington wanted the President to proclaim "a week of shame and danger." Majority Leader, Lyndon Johnson, screamed of the dire implications of this accomplishment.[16] According to Johnson:

> The Roman Empire controlled the world because it could build roads. Later when men moved to the sea - the British Empire was dominant because it had ships. Now the Communists have established a foot hold in outer space.[17]

At the same time, the launching of Sputnik created an almost quasi-hysterical condition in American education also. Without question, the schools became the scapegoat for our now second class technological status to the Soviet Union. Commenting on the Russian feat before the Congress, Senator William J. Fullbright of Arkansas, bellowed: "The real challenge we face involves the very roots of our society. It involves our educational system, the source of our knowledge and cultural values."[18] Congressional reaction was swift. On September 2, 1958, the Congress declared the existence of educational emergency in this country. To meet this emergency, it passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).[19]

NDEA: The Gifted Become a Federal Priority

References to the gifted and talented were mentioned throughout NDEA. In passing the Act, Congress declared that (1) the security of the nation required the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women; (2) the nation had to increase its efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our nation; and (3) although the states and local communities had to continue to retain control over and have primary responsibility for public education, the national interest required the federal government to provide assistance to those educational programs that were vital to our national defense.(20) Gifted and talented children thus, become a special population eligible for Federal assistance. Equally important was the fact that, from a federal perspective, they also became associated with and thought of in terms of being a vital link to our national defense.

From 1958-1962, through this Act, the Congress made over $900 million available for the following types of activities and programs it believed was vital to our national defense:

- It provided long-term, low-interest loans to college students, with up to 50 percent cancellation to students who opted to teach in public elementary and secondary schools. Special consideration was given (a) to students with a superior academic background who expressed a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools; and (b) to students whose academic background indicated a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering or a modern foreign language.

- Strengthened instruction in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages by providing laboratory equipment, audio-visual materials, minor remodeling of facilities, and state supervisory services.

- It offered graduate fellowships and stipends to help increase the numbers of students in graduate programs, especially to those interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

- It provided grants to state educational agencies to assist them in establishing and maintaining programs of testing and of guidance and counseling in secondary schools and contracted with institutions of higher education for institutes which would provide training to improve the qualifications of counselors and guidance personnel in secondary schools.

- It stimulated the improvement and extension of instruction in modern foreign language at all educational levels through the use of language and area centers, fellowships, research and studies.

- It provided financial assistance to conduct, assist, and foster research and experimentation in the development and evaluation of projects involving television, radio, motion pictures and related media of communication.

- It amended the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to authorize grants to States in assisting them with the training of individuals for employment as highly skilled technicians in occupations requiring scientific knowledge in fields necessary for the national defense.

- It established a Science Information Council and a unit within the National Science Foundation to help develop new or improved methods for making scientific information available.

- It authorized grants to states to assist their state education agencies in improving and strengthening their statistical services.(21)

Using monies from NDEA, services for the gifted and talented escalated to an all time high. Educational programs and instructional strategies such as honor classes, non-graded schools, innovative math and science curricula, modular scheduling, programmed learning, early admission to colleges, enrichment courses and accelerated learning programs flooded the schools. According to a national survey conducted by the National Education Association in 1958 approximately 77 percent of the secondary schools were then making some type of special provisions for their gifted students (100 percent in large cities and about 50 percent in small towns and suburban areas).(22) Research activities and university interest in the gifted and talented also prospered during this time. One study found that there were more articles and studies related to the gifted published between 1956 and 1959 then during the previous 30 years combined.(23)

In summary, while the early 1950's proved to be one of the darkest periods in the history of gifted and talented education, the end of the decade proved to be one of the brightest. With the realization of the nation's acute shortage

of professional manpower, its decreasing ability to compete in the technological and military race with the Soviet Union, and finally the humiliation caused by Sputnik, America saw the vital need to develop special educational programs for its more abler students. The gifted became linked to the national defense and welfare of the country. As such, federal interest and support for programs for these children reached its all time high.

1960-1970: A Decade of Retrenchment and Rethinking

Unfortunately the impact of such programs and federal interest in the gifted and talented was minimal and short lived. With the tragic death of President John F. Kennedy, his new age of excellence and dreams of building a Camelot were all but destroyed. The Whiz Kids were replaced by the builders of the Great Society and public concern and governmental attention shifted dramatically from the gifted and talented to the educationally disadvantaged and impoverished.

This shift in priorities had a number of profound implications for state and federal agencies dealing with gifted. First, without public support, many of the statutes, regulations and policies concerning the gifted which had been fought for and won at the state and local levels during the late 1950's, never became truly institutionalized. Some were never implemented, and others were frequently forgotten. Second, this shift in priorities caused a substantial proportion of federal expenditures intended to help stimulate the development of gifted programs to become spent on services which would benefit other types of students as well. Gifted monies often became spent upon such things as more guidance counselors, additional audio-visual equipment, and supplementary local and state school personnel. Finally, many of the basic precepts upon which the gifted movement was historically based came under strict public scrutiny. Advocates for the socially and educationally disadvantaged, for example, questioned the practice of singling out the intellectually gifted for special programs.

Citing the fact that IQ and scholastic aptitude tests had a relatively high correlation with socio-economic status, many demonstrated the fact that programs for the gifted too often included a disproportionately low percentage of minority-group students. In a similar fashion, others questioned the basic application of intelligence testing in general as a means for determining who should be or should not be identified as being gifted.(24)

As the public turned its attention to what it perceived to be more pressing social issues, unfortunately for the gifted and talented, it insisted that its Federal Government do likewise. Responding to this changing public attitude, the Congress during the 1960's passed an extraordinary series of laws aimed at benefiting the economically and educationally disadvantaged. The series culminated with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), through which over $1.3 billion dollars was allocated to the education of disadvantaged children in 1965 alone. Gifted and talented children, from a federal perspective, for all practical purposes, once more became a forgotten entity.

Public Law 91-230

Even though some people became discouraged over the setbacks of the 1960's, other advocates for the gifted and talented had not given up. During the first session of the 91st Congress, they were able to influence the introduction of two identical bills regarding the gifted and talented. S.718 was introduced into the Senate Chamber on January 28, 1969 by Senators Jacob Javits of New York and Winston Prouty of Vermont. In presenting the bill, Javits eloquently described the need for this legislation to his constituents:

> In 1958, in response to Sputnik the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act to identify our most gifted students and to stimulate resources toward meeting the educational needs of these students. However, today, nearly

a decade since the passage of NDEA, the Federal effort toward meeting the needs of the gifted and talented has diminished to the point that there is not one single Federal law or program devoting significant resources toward the education of gifted and talented youth, nor does the U.S. Office of Education employ anyone with responsibility in this area.

Some States have developed programs for the gifted and talented. However, little growth has taken place. Only about one-third of the states have established efforts to assess and improve the education of gifted and talented children. Study commissions have been formed, theoretical foundations established; however, very few of the over 3 million gifted and talented children of this nation are receiving the special education services they need.

Our country cannot afford to allow this to continue. We are a nation concerned about the conservation of our most treasured natural resources; the time has come for us to conserve our most precious resource, our gifted and talented children. (25)

Following Javits' introduction, Senator Prouty addressed the Senate Chamber and described this population in terms of their educational disadvantage and of the problems gifted and talented children often encounter in school systems that are unaware of their special needs:

> During the past few years Congress has enacted far-reaching legislation enabling the Federal Government to assist States, localities, school districts, and universities in providing an adequate education for all Americans. Recognizing that certain groups of youth have special problems which impede the learning process, I and the other members of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, have sponsored legislation aimed particularly at enabling schools to develop programs for the disadvantaged, handicapped, or non-English-speaking child. These programs are now reaching large numbers of American youth who ordinarily could not derive benefit from the educational facilities in their communities.
>
> However, Mr. President, there remains one large group of youth which is not being assisted. These are the gifted children of our Nation, comprising from 3 to 5 percent of the school population, or numbering over 3 million. The talented child has often been the forgotten child and the under-achiever despite his extraordinary potential because he becomes bored with unchallenging programs. It is often assumed, for example, that it is the less intelligent child who leaves school. A study conducted by Dr. Joseph L. French of Pennsylvania State University has indicated, however, that 11 percent of the high school dropouts, or some 80,000 youths having IQ's over 110 leave school before graduation each year.

> These youths have the intellectual capabilities to become professionals and leaders. We cannot afford to waste their talents.(26)

On the same day, Representative John N. Erlenborn of Illinois on behalf of himself and Representatives William H. Ayres of Ohio, Albert Quie of Minnesota, Ogden Reid of New York, William Scherle of Iowa, Marvin Esch of Michigan and Edwin Eshlement of Pennsylvania, introduced an identical bill, H.R. 4807, The Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act into the House Chamber. In presenting the House version of the bill, Representative Erlenborn made the following remarks:

> Today, we ask our Nation to adopt as policy the fact that the education of these exceptional children is a national concern.
>
> This bill provides no money; nor does it earmark any funds. Experience has shown us that funds alone are not the answer to the problems facing us. Instead, we must attack the attitudes that bind us to the status quo.(27)

To change the status quo attitudes that surrounded gifted and talented education during the 1960's, this legislation provided for the following:

(1) It established the first federal definition of gifted and talented children. The act amended Section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by adding the following definition: "The term 'gifted and talented children' means in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent."

(2) It amended Title V "Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education" of the Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) by adding the phrase "the gifted and talented." According to Senator Javits, the Congress had long realized that education was a State responsibility. As such, beginning in 1965 they had established a program under Title V of ESEA to "assist State

Departments of Education to upgrade and expand their role in the education process." By 1969, however, it was discovered that only 13 of the 50 States had one or more full-time staff members assigned to programs for the gifted and talented. Twenty-one States had no one responsible at the State level for these programs. The importance of State-level personnel was illustrated by the fact that 9 out of 10 gifted and talented children at this time come from States that employed such full-time personnel. By specifically identifying the gifted and talented as a potential target population under Title V, the Congress hoped that more States would use these monies to employ State level personnel to oversee these programs.

(3) It amended the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), Title V, Part C (Fellowships for Teachers) and Section 521 (Statement of Purpose) of the Higher Education Act by adding "gifted and talented" as a specified population. The Congress enacted P.L. 90-35, the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) on June 29, 1967 to amend and extend Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The intended purpose of EPDA was to improve the quality of teaching in the country and to meet the need for adequately trained educational personnel in a number of specific priority areas. The Act sought to accomplish this by: (1) developing information on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long-range; (2) providing a broad range of high quality training and retraining opportunities, responsive to changing manpower needs; (3) attracting a greater number of qualified persons into the teaching profession; (4) attracting persons who could stimulate creativity in the arts and other skills to undertake short-term or long-term assignments

in education; and (5) helping to make educational personnel training programs more responsive to the needs of schools and colleges.[28] Upon introducing the bill into the House Chamber, Representative Erlenborn commented on the importance of this particular provision by stating:

> There is a lack of trained personnel to administer and provide education for gifted and talented children. This amendment will make the preparation of such personnel a priority to which the Education Professions Development Act should focus its attention. At present there are only 26 colleges and universities in the Nation offering programs to prepare teachers and other personnel to work with gifted and talented children. If programs for these children are to be increased to any substantial degree, there will need to be a substantial increase in the number of personnel training programs as well as the number of personnel prepared.[29]

(4) It amended Title III "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services" of ESEA by adding "special programs for the gifted and talented" to those programs and services previously mentioned in the Title. The Congress legislated Title III "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services" of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 for three basic reasons: First, it emphasized the Congressional belief that the initiative and responsibility for the operation of school programs rested with State and local authority; Second, it indicated that the financial strain on the budgets of many local education agencies was such that it made it impossible for them to implement many of the programs and services that researchers and educators deemed essential for the effective operation of schools; and finally, it stated that local education agencies should not have to underwrite the full burden of providing model or exemplary school programs that would benefit the rest of the State or the Nation.[30] The basic purpose of Title III of ESEA, therefore, was to stimulate

and assist local education agencies with the design and development of supplementary educational services that were not often available or in sufficient quality or quantity. In addition it was also to assist in the establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs.(31)

Describing the justification and the rationale for including this amendment in the bill, Senator Javits remarked:

> Because of their unique learning nature, gifted and talented children require many services and opportunities beyond the confines of the classroom or school. Title III has demonstrated itself to be an effective tool for helping school districts to provide such services and opportunities on a multi-school or regional basis. It is the intent of this bill to focus some of the efforts of Title III on meeting the unique program needs of gifted and talented children.(32)

(5) It directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to Conduct a Study. The Act instructed the Commissioner to conduct a national investigation to determine the unique needs of the gifted population and to further suggest how the federal government might best allocate its resources to meet these needs. More specifically, the Commission through this study, was to:

> (A) determine the extent to which special educational assistance programs are necessary or useful to meet the needs of gifted and talented children,
> (B) show which existing Federal educational assistance programs are being used to meet the needs of gifted and talented children.
> (C) evaluate how existing Federal educational assistance programs can be more effectively used to meet these needs, and
> (D) recommend which new programs, if any, are needed to meet these needs.

Finally, the Act also directed the Commissioner to report his findings, together with his recommendations, to the Congress no later than one year after the

enactment of the Act.(33)

The Gifted and Talented Children's Education Assistant Act was unanimously passed in the House of Representatives on October 6, 1969 and subsequently passed by the Senate on February 19, 1970. The bill was signed into law on April 13, 1970 as Section 806, "Provisions related to gifted and talented children," of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969 (P.L. 91-230). Even though the Act did not earmark any existing funds or require new programs, it did nevertheless express the vivid concern of the Congress over the lessening national attention that was being provided to the gifted and talented during the 1960's. It also put the Congress on record as saying to the Office of Education that it was their intention that monies be spent under ESEA Titles III and V for programs for the gifted and talented.

1971-1980: A Period of Active Federal Involvement

The period from 1971 to 1980 saw a renewed interest in the gifted and talented on the part of the federal government. In keeping with the Congressional expectations set forth by the Gifted and Talented Children's Educational Assistance Act of 1969, then Commissioner of Education, Sydney Marland, submitted his nation-wide assessment regarding the status of gifted and talented education in the United States to the Congress on October 6, 1971. The major findings and conclusions of the Marland Report can be summarized by the following 12 statements:

--A conservative estimate of the gifted and talented population ranges between 1.5 and 2.5 million children out of a total elementary and secondary school population (1970 estimate) of 51.6 million.

--Existing services to the gifted and talented do not reach large and significant subpopulations (e.g. minorities and disadvantaged) and serve only a very small percentage of the gifted and talented population generally.

--Differentiated education for the gifted and talented is presently perceived as a very low priority at Federal, State, and most local levels of government and educational administration.

--Although 21 States have legislation to provide resources to school districts for services to the gifted and talented, such legislation in many cases merely represents intent.

--Even where there is a legal or administrative basis for provision of services, funding priorities, crisis concerns, and lack of personnel cause programs for the gifted to be miniscule or theoretical.

--There is an enormous individual and social cost when talent among the Nation's children and youth goes undiscovered and undeveloped. These students cannot ordinarily excel without assistance.

--Identification of the gifted is hampered not only by costs of appropriate testing--when these methods are known and adopted--but also by apathy and even hostility among teachers, administrators, guidance counselors and psychologists.

--Gifted and talented children are, in fact, deprived and can suffer psychological damage and permanent impairment of their abilities to function well which is equal to or greater than the similar deprivation suffered by any other population with special needs served by the Office of Education.

--Special services for the gifted (such as the disadvantaged) and talented will also serve other target populations singled out for attention and support.

--Services provided to gifted and talented children can and do produce significant and measurable outcomes.

--States and local communities look to the Federal Government for leadership in this area of education, with or without massive funding.

--The Federal role in delivery of services to the gifted and talented is presently all but nonexistent.(34)

The report was also proved important to the gifted movement, for two additional reasons. First, as required by P.L. 91-230 (i.e. the Commissioner shall define "gifted and talented"), it established the following definition of gifted and talented children for purposes of federal education programs:

> Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society.

Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination:

1. general intellectual ability
2. specific academic aptitude
3. creative or productive thinking
4. leadership ability
5. visual and performing arts
6. psychomotor ability (35)

In addition, it suggested that the utilization of these criteria for the identification of the gifted and talented would encompass a minimum of 3 to 5 percent of the school population.(36)

Second, from the perspective of public policy, the report depicted a rather dismal picture of how existing Federal Educational Assistance Programs were being used to meet the needs of gifted and talented children. The study found, for example, that less than 15 percent of the States were spending any of their ESEA Title I monies to identify or develop special programs to meet the needs of gifted and talented youngsters from deprived areas. Furthermore, it discovered that only 10 percent of the States had used ESEA Title III monies for programs or services directed at the gifted and talented and that only nine of the States had utilized ESEA Title V monies to strengthen their programs for these students. Finally, the report concluded that 62 percent of the States had used none of the available federal resources to provide for their gifted and talented children.

The implications extrapolated from the Marland Report were clear--efforts to stimulate the development of gifted and talented programs through the use of unspecified Federal appropriations were not directly benefiting gifted children. A way was, therefore, needed by which Federal assistance and appropriations could directly reach gifted and talented students as well as those agencies most concerned with their education.

Public Law 93-380

Responding to the needs set out in the Marland Report, three almost identical bills regarding the gifted and talented were introduced during the first session of the 93rd Congress. S.874, the Gifted and Talented Children's Educational Assistance Act, was introduced into the Senate Chamber on February 15, 1973 by Senators Jacob Javits of New York and Harrison Williams of New Jersey. In presenting the bill, Javits stated the following facts in support of the need for new legislation for the gifted.

> The Office of Education has pointed out that only 4 percent of the estimated 2 million gifted and talented youth received planned, expert guidance and encouragement. In one State a study found that 55 percent of the gifted students were working below their mental abilities. In another State, 18 percent of high school dropouts were gifted students. Clearly this is a waste of a most valuable national resource. It is vital that the full potential of these young people be developed.
>
> Only 22 States have laws to provide funds for education of the gifted and many of these programs are not funded. And in only 10 States, have the State departments of education engaged at least one full-time staff person to identify and help the gifted. This points to the need for a Federal program to stimulate effective State and local action.(37)

Senator Williams added the following comments:

> Section 806C of Public Law 91-230 authorized the Commissioner of Education to prepare a report on gifted and talented children and to examine problems, needs, and recommendations for improing services to these children. The report, completed late in 1971, called for an increased role for Federal and State education agencies in identifying and assisting gifted and talented children through creation of educational services designed for them alone. It was the report's conclusion that present education programs will not improve learning conditions for such children without substantial changes which will enable gifted and talented children to benefit from these programs.(38)

Essentially, S.874 called for the following:

(1) the establishment of an administrative unit for the gifted and talented within the U.S. Office of Education.

(2) the authorization of $1 million in fiscal years 1973-75 for the establishment of a National Clearinghouse on Gifted and Talented Children and Youth.

(3) the authorization of $50 million in FY 1973 and $60 million in FY 1974 and 1975 for grants to States to initiate, expand, and improve programs for the gifted and talented with the following provisions:

- 85 percent of these monies would be distributed to the States based upon the ratio of their children aged 3 to 18 compared to the ratio of such children throughout the United States.
- No State would be allocated less than $50,000 under this section.
- 15 percent of these monies would be used by the Commissioner to make grants and contracts for the establishment and operation of model projects.

(4) the authorization of $15 million in FY 1973, $20 million in FY 1974, and $25 million in FY 1975 for (a) grants for the training of personnel engaged in or preparing to engage in the education of the gifted and talented or as supervisors of such personnel; and (b) grants for the training of leadership personnel, including but not limited to teacher trainers, school administrators, supervisors, researchers, and State consultants. At least 50 percent but not more than 75 percent of these monies, however, were to be spent on the training grants described under (a).

(5) the authorization of $14 million in FY 1973, $16 million in FY 1974, and $18 million in FY 1975 to the National Institute of Education for research and related purposes related to the education of gifted and talented children and youth.(39)

Two comments should be made with regard to S.874 before proceeding further. First, the bill called for a considerable increase in appropriations for the gifted and talented (e.g., $80 million for FY 1973; $97 million for FY 1974, and $104 million for FY 1975). Second S.874 closely followed a Congressional format that had been previously applied to a number of bills, including the handicapped, that grew into much larger programs of federal assistance (e.g., it sought to establish a basic state grant program along with separate funding categories for areas such as personnel development, leadership training, research, and the establishment of a clearinghouse.) Unfortunately for the gifted and talented, as will be described next, this legislative package never really materialized.

The two other bills that were introduced during the 93rd Congress with respect to the gifted and talented were done so in the House of Representatives. H.R.5718 was introduced into the House Chamber on March 15, 1978 by William Lehman of Florida and H.R.7100 by Dominick Daniels of New Jersey on April 17, 1978. For all practical purposes, as has been previously stated, both were identical to the Javits' and Williams' Senate proposal. To the dismay of the supporters of these bills, however, neither ever emerged from the House Subcommittee on General Education to which they were referred to for debate. Advocates for the gifted thus turned their eyes and their attention to the Senate.

Unlike H.R.5718 and H.R.7100, S.874 did receive considerable attention from the subcommittee to which it was referred. Unfortunately, even though it was reported out of Subcommittee and became incorporated into the Senate's 1974 proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (S.1539), S.874 did suffer considerable change during the legislative process. The bill became involved in a much larger Congressional struggle involving the consolidation of a number of federal entitlements and the development of a new Commissioner discretionary grant program. As a result, gifted and talented education became one of six designated special projects to which the U.S. Commissioner was directed by the Congress to pay particular attention to. The other five included: community schools, career education, consumer education, women's equity in education, and metric education. When the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380) were signed into law on August 21, 1974, gifted and talented education became a part of the Special Projects Act.

Section 404 of P.L. 93-380, entitled "Gifted and Talented Children," however, looked somewhat different from the original bill that was introduced by Senators Javits and Williams. The new Act called for the following:

(1) <u>An Administrative Unit Within the U.S. Office of Education</u>

The Act provided the statutory authority to establish an administrative

unit within the U.S. Office of Education to "administer the programs and projects authorized by the Act and to coordinate all Federal programs for gifted and talented children and youth." Prior to this in 1972 an Office of Gifted and Talented had been administratively created and housed within the U.S. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped without statutory authority.

(2) The Creation of a National Clearinghouse for the Gifted and Talented.

(3) Grants to State and Local Educational Agencies.

The act provided for the authorization of grants to State and local education agencies to help them in "the planning, development, operation, and improvement of programs and projects designed to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children at the preschool and elementary and secondary school levels."

(4) Grants for Training, Research, and Model Projects.

The act authorized the provision grants and contracts for (a) the training of personnel engaged or preparing to engage in educating gifted and talented children or as supervisors of such personnel; (b) the training of leadership personnel including, but not limited to, teacher trainers, school administrators, supervisors, researchers, and State consultants; (c) a program of research and related activities relating to the education of gifted and talented children; and (d) the establishment and operation of model projects for the identification and education of gifted and talented children.

(5) An Annual Authorization of Appropriations Not to Exceed $12.25 Million.[40]

To some, the legislative compromises that took place to assure the passage of Section 404 of P.L. 93-380 proved extremely disappointing. Many pointed to

the reduction of authorization levels from $80 million to $12.25 million as representing only a token interest on the part of the federal government in providing the services truly needed by this population. Others, however, saw the passage of this law to be a milestone in the history of federal involvement in gifted and talented education. A total of $2.56 million was appropriated to the Commissioner in 1975 to carry out the provisions of this Act. With this entitlement, gifted and talented children for the first time became the direct recipients of federal funds and assistance.

A Call For An Expanded Federal Role

While the early and mid-1970's did see considerable changes with regard to the development of educational programs for the gifted and talented, many people still saw the need for a greater federal participation in the provision of these services. Appearing before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education in 1977, Dr. Dorothy Sisk, then Director of the U.S. Office of Gifted and Talented, indicated that the aggregate number of gifted and talented children reported served had increased from 4 percent in 1972 to 14 percent of this population in 1977. While this number did demonstrate considerable progress, Sisk cautioned that this increase nevertheless still meant that 86 percent of the potential gifted and talented children in this country were still not receiving the special education they needed or deserved.(41)

Responding to the need to dramatically increase the federal role in the education of gifted and talented children, representatives of The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped on February 24, 1977 and the House Select Education Subcommittee on April 25, 1977. CEC argued that the following legislative action needed to take place:

(1) That the current federal definition of handicapped children (Education of the Handicapped Act, Part A, Section 602) for

educational purposes be changed to a definition of "exceptional children," and that gifted and talented children be included in that revised definition.

(2) That the current Bureau of Education for the Handicapped within the Office of Education be redesignated as the "Bureau of Education for Exceptional Persons," with a clear understanding that gifted and talented children are a priority target population of that redesignated bureau.

(3) That, wherever appropriate, the Commissioner-Discretionary Programs (EHA, Part C - Centers and Services to Meet the Special Needs of the Handicapped, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Part E - Research in the Education of the Handicapped, Part F - Instructional Media for the Handicapped) be expanded to include gifted and talented children as an eligible target population along with handicapped children.

(4) That a new Part G be created, providing for a modest program of grants to state and local education agencies for the development, operation, and improvement of programs and projects to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children (identical to one component of what has been previously authorized in ESEA Title IV, Section 404).

(5) That the current ESEA Title IV, Section 404, be allowed to expire as well as the current Office of Gifted and Talented within BEH, since they would no longer be necessary because of the proposed enlarged scope of the BEH program. To maintain an internal advocacy force and to insure that the interests of the gifted and talented are properly represented, however, a new position needs to be established directly under and responsible to the head of the bureau.

(6) Where needed, authorization levels for EHA Parts C through F be revised to conform to this enlarged mission on behalf of all exceptional children.(42)

On March 14, 1978, Congressman Carl Pursell (R-MI) introduced H.R. 11533, The Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978, into the House of Representatives. Joining Pursell in co-sponsoring this amendment were Representatives John Brademas of Indiana, Albert Quie of Minnesota, Shirley Chisholm of New York, Larry Pressler of South Dakota, and Dale Kildee of Michigan. Commenting on the need for this legislation, Pursell proclaimed:

> In recent times we have witnessed this much-needed effort to provide disadvantaged students with the opportunity to realize their educational potential. However, we have yet to offer our gifted and talented students this same opportunity to realize their porential. I think the time has come to insure that every child is offered the kind of education that will help him/her to realize his/her individual potential.(43)

H.R. 11533 called for the following.

(1) The establishment of a broad-based local program of assistance. The bill authorized the Commissioner to make grants to local education agencies for the "planning, establishment and improvement" of special education programs for gifted and talented children with the following stipulations:

- Fifty-five percent of the monies appropriated for this Act would be used to fund this section.
- One-half of these grants would be awarded for projects which proposed innovative and promising approaches in the special education of gifted and talented children.
- One-half of these grants would be awarded to local applicants stressing the identification and special education of disadvantaged gifted and talented children.

(2) The establishment of a broad-based state program of assistance. The bill authorized grants to assist state education agencies in their planning, development, and improvement of programs for the gifted and talented as well as to provide financial assistance for the training of personnel to meet the special educational needs of these children. Thirty percent of the total appropriation must be used for this part.

(3) Research and demonstration. The remaining 15 percent of the total appropriation would be allocated for Commissioner-approved grants for research and demonstration, including authority for a clearinghouse.

(4) A new federal definition. According to Pursell, "This bill reject(ed) the notion of a Federal response to the total universe of gifted and talented, and instead respond(ed) to practical instructional reality, namely children assessed by the school systems, through the use of professionally appropriate and acknowledged methods, as gifted and talented who by reason thereof require(d) those necessary adjustments in their educational environment in order that the achievement of

their potential (would) not be thwarted." [44] To this end, H.R. 11533 called for gifted and talented children to be defined as:

> ...children and, where applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability or in performing and visual arts, who by reason thereof, require special education services.[45]

(5) Authorization of funds. To carry out the provisions set forth in this Act, the bill authorized the following funds: $10 million for fiscal year 1979; $15 million for fiscal year 1980; $20 million for fiscal year 1981; and $25 million for fiscal years 1982 and 1983.

On the following day, March 15, 1978, Senator Jacob Javits of New York introduced S. 2749: Gifted and Talented Children--Education Consolidation Improvement into the Senate Chamber. Commenting on the need for this legislation, Javits told his fellow Senators:

> ...the $2.56 million current appropriation for this program is insufficient. If the estimate of 2 million gifted and talented children in this country is even roughly correct, then this expenditure of little more than $1 per gifted child is the merest minimal price to pay to identify the gifted and enhance not merely their lives but, through them, the lives of all of us and, it is less than a quarter of the annual authorization of $12.25 million.
>
> In fiscal year 1976, over 400 applications for local project funding were received by the Office of the Gifted and Talented; more than 20 applications were received for each such project funded. Obviously, current needs are thus not being served by efforts at either the local or Federal level. There is a great heretofore unsatisfied demand for a new legislative direction to meet both present and future requirements of the gifted and talented children who represent the best of America's patrimony.[46]

Javits called for the transfer of gifted and talented education out of the Special Projects Act and the creation of a new Part D under Title IV (Libraries, Learning Resources, Education Innovation, and Support) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He rationalized the transfer by stating:

> ...the gifted and talented program deserves special attention. Current needs...are not being met by the small-scale demonstration project thrust of Federal gifted and talented activity. This bill,

> by creating a new part within the title IV consolidation, establishes the necessary and proper focus for the gifted and talented, yet does not expressly create another categorical education program. By using the current concepts and mechanisms of the title IV-C allocation formula for the gifted and talented program, the new Part D will be relatively simple to administer at both the State and Federal levels.(47)

The Act called for an authorization of $50 million in fiscal year 1979, which was to be allotted to states on the basis of their relative proportion of school-age children, 5-17 inclusive. To encourage intrastate growth, states were expected to match the federal support with their own fiscal entitlements by gradually phasing into a 50-50 state-federal match by fiscal year 1983.

Of the total funds appropriated under the Act, 75 percent were to be reserved for states to distribute to their local education agencies on a competitive grant basis. In addition, not less than one-quarter of this money was to be distributed and used by the local education agencies for programs and projects which included the identification and education of disadvantaged gifted and talented children from low income families. Finally, the Commissioner of Education was to be given discretionary authority over the remaining 25 percent of the total funds for activities similar to those then being funded under the gifted and talented component of the Special Projects Act (namely, the training of leadership personnel and educators, model projects of identification and education, and the operation of an information clearinghouse).

A third bill related to the education of gifted and talented children was subsequently introduced into the 95th Congress by Senator Robert Stafford of Vermont. The Stafford amendment--Amendment No. 1761--called for the transfer of gifted and talented education out of the Special Projects Act and into the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) as a new Part H. Stafford argued:

> What distinguishes the bill I am introducing is that it would acknowledge and reinforce existing professional and administrative interaction between the special education of gifted and talented children and the special education of handicapped children. The advantages of doing so are:

Historically, special educators and administrators have perceived themselves as belonging to a profession committed to the education of all exceptional children, handicapped, and gifted.

Already 26 of the States take the combined (exceptional child) direction in their statutory and/or administrative approaches.

Such an approach avoids both the duplication of many existing delivery systems and the impossible task of creating wholly new delivery systems nationwide.

The U.S. Office for Gifted and Talented already is housed within and is under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bureau for Education of the Handicapped.(48)

Stafford's bill called for an initial authorization of $25 million in fiscal year 1979 with an increase of $10 million annually until 1982 when it was to reach an authorization level of $55 million. Under the Act, the U.S. Commissioner was authorized to make the following types of grants and contracts:

1. Grants to State and Local Education Agencies to assist them in the planning, development, operation, and improvement of programs designed to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children. Of these grants, 25 percent must be made to LEA's which meet Title I eligibility criteria.
2. Grants for Personnel Development to state education agencies, institutions of higher education and other appropriate institutions or agencies to assist them in providing preservice or inservice training to personnel related to the education of gifted and talented children. Where appropriate, the Commissioner is further authorized to combine a grant to an approved recipient under Part D--Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped under EHA.
3. Grants for Research and Demonstration Projects to develop and conduct research, surveys, demonstrations, model programs, and an information clearinghouse to help meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children. Where appropriate, the Commissioner is also authorized to combine a grant to an approved recipient under this section with a grant to an approved recipient under Part C--Centers and Services to Meet the Special Needs of the Handicapped--and Part E--Research in the Education of the Handicapped under EHA.

Finally, similar to H.R. 11533, the Stafford amendment sought to sidestep the impossible notion of an instantaneous federal response to the total universe of gifted and talented children by proposing the following definition for this population:

> 'gifted and talented' means children and, where applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability or in performing and visual arts, who by reason thereof, require special education services.(49)

Compromise and Final Passage

The House version of the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978 was successfully reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee on April 5, 1978. The passage of this amendment, from the perspective of federal educational policy, was significant in the fact that it represented the first time that the U.S. House of Representatives had originated its own provision for the education of gifted and talented children. The Senate version, on the other hand, was approved by the Senate Human Resources Committee on May 5, 1978, when a compromise was reached between Senators Javits and Stafford. The final Senate bill called for the creation of a combination state-formula grant and Commissioner-discretionary grant program. Under the bill, 75 percent of the monies allocated by the Act were to be distributed to the states based on their relative school-age population, ages 5 to 17 inclusive. State education agencies, in turn, were to be required to distribute 90 percent of these funds to local education agencies on a competitive grant basis. At the same time, the Commissioner was to be given discretionary authority over the remaining 25 percent of the funds for activities similar to those then funded under the gifted and talented component of the Special Projects Act. Finally, the Senate bill provided that before any of Title IV of ESEA could be funded, at least 5 percent of the total appropriations for this title had to be provided for gifted and talented education. When the Senate version reached the

floor of the Senate for final approval, Warren Magnuson of Washington, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, led a successful fight to delete this final provision from the bill. Seeing this happen and realizing the small amount of appropriations (i.e., $2.56 million) then allocated to this program, many advocates for the gifted and talented became convinced that the state formula grant program proposed by the Senate was simply unrealistic at this point in time. Furthermore, others feared that the inclusion of gifted and talented education in Title IV would jeopardize a major source of additional funding for this population, namely, Title IV-C monies.

The final version of this legislation reflected these two concerns. First, after considerable debate, the Senate conceded that the Act should become free standing and agreed to the House recommendation that it be placed in Title IX (Additional Programs) of the Education Amendments of 1978. Second, a major compromise was also reached with regard to the type of program to be established. As can be seen from the analysis of the Act printed below, the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978 began as a discretionary state grant program. Essentially, any SEA that submitted an application which fully met the requirements of this Act and was approved by the Commissioner, was entitled to receive at least $50,000 under this part. Once the level of appropriations for this Act, however, reached $15 million, such monies were to be distributed by a state formula grant program based upon each state's school-age population, ages 5 to 17 inclusive.

Overall, the new bill allowed for financial entitlements to state education agencies to assist them in the planning, development, operation, and improvement of programs designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children. In addition, under this Act, the U.S. Commissioner is authorized to make discretionary grants for such activities as the training of personnel engaged in the education of gifted and talented children orin the supervision of such personnel, the training of national leadership personnel, model projects, research, demonstration programs, statewide planning activities, and the establishment of a clearinghouse.

Other final legislative agreements as well as section by section analysis of the Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978 are as follows:

GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN'S EDUCATION ACT OF 1978

Findings

The Congress hereby finds and declares that:

(1) The nation's greatest resource for solving critical national problems in areas of national concern is its gifted and talented children;

(2) unless the special abilities of gifted and talented children are developed during their elementary and secondary school years, their special potentials for assisting the Nation may be lost, and

(3) gifted and talented children from economically disadvantaged families and areas often are not afforded the opportunity to fulfill their specal and valuable potentials, due to inadequate or inappropriate educational services. (Sec. 901(b))

Purpose

It is the purpose of this part to provide financial assistance to state and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations, to assist such agencies, institutions and organizations, to plan, develop, operate, and improve programs designed to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented children. (Sec. 901(c))

Definition

For the purpose of this part, the term 'gifted and talented children' means children and, whenever applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance responsibility in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability, or in the performing and visual arts, and who by reason thereof, requires services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school. (Sec. 902)

Authorization of Appropriations

For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1979; $30,000,000 for fiscal year 1980; $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1981; $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1982; and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1983. (Sec. 903(a))

- From such amounts, the Commissioner shall receive 25 percentum or $5 million, whichever is less, for carrying out the provisions of Section 905—related to Commissioner discretionary programs. (Sec. 903(b)(1))
- The remainder of the sums appropriated shall be available to carry out the provisions of Section 904—related to state programs. (Sec. 903(b)(2))

Federal Share

The federal share for any fiscal year shall be 90 percentum, except that the clearinghouse activities, research evaluation, and related activities, and programs and projects involving the participation of students in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools shall be 100 percentum.

State Programs

I. *State Grant Program*

- The Commissioner, from the amounts available (e.g., at least 75 percentum of the total sums appropriated—see above) shall make grants to state education agencies (SEA's) for the federal share of the cost of planning, developing, operating, and improving programs designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children at the preschool, elementary and secondary levels. These programs may include inservice training of personnel to teach such children. (Sec. 904(a))
- The SEA will distribute, on a competitive basis, not less than 90 percentum of such funds to local educational agencies (LEA's) within the state. (Sec. 904(c)(2)(B))

State Minimum

No SEA that submits an application which fully meets all the requirements of this section, and is approved by the Commissioner, will receive less than $50,000 in that fiscal year. (If the sums appropriated for making payments under this subsection are not sufficient to pay in full the amount to which each SEA is entitled under the previous sentence, such amounts shall be ratably reduced). (Sec. 904(b)(1))

State Application

Each SEA desiring to receive a grant under this section must submit an application with assurances that the funds it receives under this part will be expended solely to plan, develop, operate, and improve programs and projects which—

1. are designed to identify the educational needs of gifted and talented children;
2. are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to hold reasonable promise of making substantial progress toward meeting such needs, and
3. give appropriate consideration to the particular educational needs of disadvantaged gifted and talented children. (Sec. 904(2)(c)(1))

Administrative Set-Aside

The SEA can reserve up to 10 percentum of the funds it receives under this section for the purpose of administration, technical assistance, coordination, and statewide planning related to programs and projects designed to meet the needs of gifted and talented children. (Sec. 904(c)(2)(A))

Disadvantaged

The SEA will use at least 50 percentum of the funds made available under this section for programs and projects which include a component for the identification and education of disadvantaged gifted and talented children from low income families. (Sec. 904(c)(3))

Instructional Equipment

The SEA and LEA's may use funds made available under this section to acquire instructional equipment only if such equipment will enhance the program or project for which such funds are furnished. (Sec. 904(c)(4))

Private School Children

- The SEA is to abide by the requirements of Title IV, Section 406 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (relating to the participation of pupils and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools) unless it determines that such requirements cannot legally be met in the state. (Sec. 904(c)(5)(A))
- The SEA will not approve the application of an LEA under this section unless it determines that the needs of children in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools have been taken into account in designing its application through consultation with private school officials and by other appropriate means. (Sec. 904 (c)(5)(B))

Technical Assistance

The SEA will provide technical assistance in preparing proposals and in planning, developing, and operating programs under this section to LEA's which are unable to compete due to smaller size, or lack of financial resources. (Sec. 904(c)(6))

II. *State Allotment Program*

- In any fiscal year in which appropriations for this part are equal to or exceed $15 million the Commissioner shall allot, from the amounts available for the state programs, not more than 1 percentum among—
  1. Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands;
  2. programs for children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools operated for Indian children by the Department of the Interior; and
  3. programs authorized for children and teachers in overseas dependent schools of the Department of Defense. (Sec. 906(a)(1))
- From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner shall allot to each state which has an application meeting the requirements of the previous section an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children in the state aged 5 to 17 years, inclusive, bears to the number of children in all states, except that no state shall receive less than $50,000 in any such fiscal year. (Sec. 906(a)(2))

Discretionary Programs

- The Commissioner, from the 25 percentum or $5 million whichever is less, reserved for him, may make grants to SEA's, LEA's, institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations to assist them in establishing or maintaining programs or projects designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children including the training of personnel in educating gifted and talented children or in supervising such personnel. (Sec. 905(a)(1))
- Not more than 20 percentum of the sums available under this section may be used for grants to institutions of higher education for the training of national leadership personnel. (Sec. 905)

Inservice

The Commissioner may, from these same monies, make grants to SEA's to assist them, either directly or through arrangements by the SEA with other institutions, agencies and organizations eligible to receive funds under this part, to provide for the training of personnel engaged in the education of gifted and talented children or in the supervision of such personnel. (Sec. 905(a)(2))

Model Projects

The Commissioner is authorized to enter into contracts with, and make grants to, public agencies and private organizations, including SEA's and LEA's, to establish and operate model projects for the identification and education of gifted and talented children. (Sec. 905(a)(3))

Clearinghouse

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, public agencies, private organizations, or institutions which together or singularly constitute a clearinghouse to disseminate information about programs, services, resources, research, methodology, and media materials for the education of gifted and talented children. (Sec. 905 (a)(4))

Statewide Planning

The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to SEA's to assist them in the statewide planning, development, operation, and improvement of programs and projects designed to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented children. (Sec. 905(a)(5))

Research and Demonstration

- The Commissioner is authorized to conduct, either directly or by grant or contract, a program of research, evaluation, and related activities pertaining to the education of gifted and talented children, and may transfer to the National Institute of Education not more than 20 percentum of the funds available to carry out the provisions of this section. (Sec. 905(a)(6))

- For purposes of this section, the term 'research, evaluation, and related activities' means research, research training, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education of gifted and talented children and youth, or the dissemination of information derived from such research, surveys, or demonstrations, and all such activities, including experimental and model schools. (Sec 905(c)(2))

Private School Children

The requirements of Title IV, Section 406 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (relating to the participation of pupils and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools) shall apply to programs and projects under this section unlesss the SEA determines that such requirements cannot legally be met in the state. (Sec. 905(b)(2))

FOOTNOTES

[1]Gardner, John, Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too? (New York: Harper and Row, 1961).

[2]Tannenbaum, Abraham J., "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate Concern about the Gifted," The Gifted and the Talented, Seventy-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 5.

[3]Laurence, William L., "There be light," New York Times, August 7, 1945.

[4]Manchester, William, The Glory and the Dream (Boston-Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1973), pp. 381-382.

[5]Ibid., p. 474.

[6]Ibid., p. 488.

[7]P.L. 81-247, The National Science Foundation Act, 1950.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Gallagher, James J., and Weiss, Patricia, The Education of Gifted and Talented Students (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1979), p. 17.

[10]Heck, Arch O., Special Schools and Classes in Cities of 10,000 Population and More in the United States (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930). Heck, Arch O., The Education of Exceptional Children (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953), p. 378.

[11]Ohio Commission on Children and Youth, The Status of the Gifted in Ohio (Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Department of Education, 1951).

[12]Spring, Joel, The Sorting Machine--National Educational Policy Since 1945 (New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1976), p. 5.

[13]Wolfe, Dael, "America's Intellectual Resources," National Association of Secondary School Principals, January 1952, pp. 125-135.

[14]Wolfe, Dael, America's Resources of Specialized Talent (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).

[15]Rickover, Hyman G., Education and Freedom (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959), pp. 111-130.

[16]Op.cit., Manchester, The Glory and the Dream, p. 788.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Public Law 85-864, The National Defense Education Act of 1958, September 2, 1958.

[20]Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Goldberg, Miriam L., "Educating the Talented," White House Conference on Education--A Milestone for Educational Progress (Washington, D.C.: Senate Subcommittee on Education, 1965), p. 92.

[23] Albett, R.S., "Present Day Status of the Concept and its Implications for the Study of Creativity and Giftedness," American Psychologist, 24(8), 1969, pp. 743-753.

[24] Op.cit., Tannenbaum, "Pre-Sputnik to Post-Watergate Concern About the Gifted," p. 15.

[25] Javits, Jacob, "S. 718--Introduction of Gifted and Talented Children Education Assistance Act," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, January 28, 1969), p. S971.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Erlenborn, John, "Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, January 28, 1969), p. H517.

[28] Public Law 90-35, To Amend Title V of the Higher Education Act and Redesignate It As the Educational Professions Development Act, June 29, 1967.

[29] Op.cit., Erlenborn, "Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act."

[30] Public Law 89-10, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III--Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, Guidance, Counseling, and Testing, April 11, 1965.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Op.cit., Javits, "S. 718--Introduction of Gifted and Talented Children Education Assistance Act."

[33] Ibid.

[34] Marland, Jr., Sidney P., Education of the Gifted and Talented, Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 3-4.

[35] Ibid., p. 2.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Javits, Jacob, "Gifted and Talented Children's Educational Assistance Act," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, February 15, 1973).

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Public Law 93-380, Education Amendments of 1974, Part IV, Section 404, Gifted and Talented Children, August 21, 1974.

[41]Sisk, Dorothy, Hearings Before U.S. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, July 19, 1977, Part 7: Special Projects Act and Miscellaneous Programs, pp. 332-333.

[42]Perry, Harold, Hearings Before U.S. Subcommittee on Select Education, April 25, 1977, pp. 5-32.

[43]Pursell, Carl, "Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 14, 1978), p. H2028.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Javits, Jacob, "Gifted and Talented Children--Education Consolidation Improvement," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 15, 1978), p. S3752.

[47]Ibid., p. S3753.

[48]Stafford, Robert, "Amendment No. 1761--Special Education of Gifted and Talented Children," Congressional Record (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 5, 1978), p. S4815.

[49]Ibid.